

**REMARKS**

The Official Action mailed September 22, 2010, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on February 20, 2004; October 11, 2005; October 30, 2006; May 8, 2007; July 20, 2007; December 2, 2008; December 30, 2008; March 2, 2009; June 4, 2009; January 5, 2010 and May 21, 2010.

A further Information Disclosure Statement was submitted in October 4, 2010, and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

The Applicant also notes with appreciation the indication of the allowability of claims 114-120.

Claims 12-14, 24-26, 63-84, 89-110 and 112-120 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. Claims 114-120 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 12, 24, 63, 67, 71, 75, 79, 103 and 108 have been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of the canceled claims. Accordingly, claims 12-14, 24-26, 63-84, 89-110, 112 and 113 are now pending in the present application, of which claims 12, 24, 63, 67, 71, 75, 79, 103 and 108 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Official Action rejects claims 63-66, 79-83, 98 and 102 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,509,217 to Reddy and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0192886 to Inoue. The Official Action rejects claims 12-14, 24, 25, 67-70, 89-90, 92, 96, 97, 99, 103-109, 112 and 113 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0032210 to Takayama, Reddy and Inoue. The Official Action rejects claims 84, 91, and 95 as obvious based on the combination of Reddy, Inoue and Takayama. The Official Action rejects claims 26, 75-78, 94, 101 and 110 as obvious

based on the combination of Takayama, Reddy, Inoue and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0027247 to Arao. The Official Action rejects claims 71-74 and 100 as obvious based on the combination of Reddy, Inoue and Arao. The Official Action rejects claim 93 as obvious based on the combination of Reddy, Inoue, Arao and Takayama.

With respect to these rejections, independent claims 12, 24, 63, 67, 71, 75, 79, 103, and 108 are each amended to recite the allowable feature from canceled claims 112-120 that the wiring is "directly connected to" an impurity region of the semiconductor film.

Because the various combinations of references fail to teach all claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained with respect to independent claims 12, 24, 63, 67, 71, 75, 79, 103, and 108, as amended, or claims dependent therefrom. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.


Claims 84, 91 and 95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,509,217 to Reddy in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0192886 to Inoue and U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0032210 to Takayama. Claim 93 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,509,217 to Reddy in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0192886 to Inoue and U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0027247 to Arao et al and U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0032210 to Takayama.

The rejections for these claims should also be reconsidered and withdrawn, since corresponding independent claims are in condition for allowance, as described above.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(a), 1.20(b), 1.20(c), and 1.20(d) (except the Issue Fee) which may be required now or hereafter, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2280.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Eric J. Robinson  
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.  
3975 Fair Ridge Drive  
Suite 20 North  
Fairfax, Virginia 22033  
(571) 434-6789